

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
CIVIL MINUTE ORDER**

**CASE NO.: C06-2361 WHA (JCS)**

**CASE NAME: Netflix v. Blockbuster**

**MAGISTRATE JUDGE JOSEPH C. SPERO      COURTROOM DEPUTY: Karen Hom**

**DATE: Oct. 4, 2006      TIME: 30 mins      COURT REPORTER: Connie Kuhl**

**COUNSEL FOR PLAINTIFF:  
Jeff Chanin & Gene Paige**

**COUNSEL FOR DEFENDANT:  
William O'Brien**

---

**PROCEEDINGS**

- ☐ SETTLEMENT CONFERENCE                      ☐ FURTHER SETTLEMENT CONFERENCE
- ☐ DISCOVERY CONFERENCE
- ☐ STATUS CONFERENCE RE: \_\_\_\_\_
- ☒ TELEPHONIC CONFERENCE RE: Joint Statement re: Proposed Protective Order [docket no. 51]
- ☐ OTHER: \_\_\_\_\_

CASE CONTINUED TO: \_\_\_\_\_ FOR \_\_\_\_\_

**NOTES:**

Court ruled that there will be no access for now to "Attorneys Eyes Only" material to any in-house counsel. There will be no special provision on the source code which can be designated "Attorneys' Eyes Only". With respect to patent prosecution, any firm that receives "Attorneys' Eyes Only" information in this case agrees that they will not participate in patent prosecution work for the clients in this case for a period ending two (2) years after the case is concluded, including all appeals, with the following two exceptions: In the event that the opposing party in this case initiates a contested proceeding before the PTO, which is not included as patent prosecution work, and shall not count as patent prosecution work delivering copies or lists of prior art to client or counsel.

Plaintiff will re-draft the proposed protective order

CC:      Chambers